



## King's Research Portal

*Document Version*  
Other version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Roueché, C., & Ballance, M. (2001). Three inscriptions from Ovacik. In M. Harrison, & W. Young (Eds.), *Mountain and Plain: From the Lycian Coast to the Phrygian Plateau in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Period* (pp. 87 - 112). University of Michigan.

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Mountain and Plain

From the Lycian Coast to the  
Phrygian Plateau in the Late Roman and  
Early Byzantine Period

by Martin Harrison

edited by Wendy Young

Ann Arbor

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PRESS

## Appendix 2

### Three Inscriptions from Ovacık

*Michael Ballance and Charlotte Roueché*

The three inscriptions published here were copied by Martin Harrison at Ovacık in 1975 (inscription I) and 1978 (inscriptions II and III, on a single block). While Harrison reported their existence and cited some lines,<sup>1</sup> the extreme difficulty of reading inscription I delayed his publication of the group. Inscriptions II and III have since been seen and published; but we are publishing the three together here, because they are so clearly related to one another. We have worked from the squeezes, the notebooks, and the photographs, some of which are published here, but neither of us has seen the stones; we have no doubt that the readings can — and will — be improved by further study. The fragments that make up inscription I and the block that contains inscriptions II and III are under the care of the Antalya Museum, in their Archaeological Research Station at Elmalı.<sup>2</sup>

A wide range of study and excavation focused on Lycia and Pisidia has given a great deal more context to these texts than was available when they were first found. The lines from inscription I published by Harrison in 1979 have occasionally been referred to in subsequent publications; in 1996 Martin

We are very grateful to Elizabeth Harrison for the privilege of presenting the important material in these three inscriptions. We are greatly indebted to Nicholas Milner, Stephen Mitchell, Gary Reger, Christof Schuler, and Martin Zimmerman, who have all offered us extremely useful information, guidance, and advice on aspects of the texts, in the best spirit of the epigraphic *koinon*; the errors that remain are our own.

All the abbreviations are as in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) with the following additions:

- ACO E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1922–)  
BullÉp J. and L. Robert, "Bulletin Épigraphique," annually from 1938 in *Revue des Études Grecques*  
LBW P. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines* (Paris, 1870)

1. See R. M. Harrison. "Nouvelles Découvertes Romaines Tardives et Paléobyzantines en Lycie," *CRAI* (1979), 237, whence the Greek text was published as *SEG* 29 (1979): 1514 and *BullEp* 1980.488; more fully, "Upland Settlements in Early Mediaeval Lycia," *ACLA* 27 (1980): 112–14.

2. They were identified there by Prof. Machteld Mellink (Bryn Mawr College) and, in 1998, by Professor Gary Reger (Trinity College, Hartford), who transcribed II, III, and parts of I.





been well prepared for inscribing, so they vary considerably in shape and size; sigma is square, omega is angular, and alpha has a straight crossbar.

#### Ovacik I.A.i (figs. 83–84)

The text is made up of an upper and lower part, joining at line 11. There is an uninscribed area of ca. 0.15 meters before the text begins. In this is a dowel hole ( $0.035 \times 0.017 \times 0.03$  m) at 0.08 meters from the top, set centrally, and below it is what may be a graffito of a sun.

#### Contents

This is the only side that clearly opens at the beginning of a document; it is therefore very probably the first side.

Lines 1–22 appear to be a letter from [M.] Aurelius Ursio, *dux*, to Hermaios, son of Askoureus.

#### Text

- [? M. Αὐ]ρ. Οὐρσίων ὁ δι-  
 [αση]μώτατος δοῦξ  
 [Ἐρ]μαίῳ Ἀσκου[ρ]-  
 [έως] ν. χαιρεῖν. ν.  
 5 [ἄμ]α τῷ λαβεῖν  
 [τ]αῦτα γράμματα  
 τοῦ[ς] γ[ε]αν[ί]σκους  
 [ἐπ]ιλέκτους δεῖ  
 [πο]λείτας ΤΟΝΑ  
 10 [ . . . ca. 7/9 . . . ] ΛΤΟΝ  
 Ι[ . . . ca. 11/13 . . . ] Ι[ῆ]-  
 μέρων Ι[ . . . ca. 7/9 . . . ]  
 ΘΕ αὐτοῦ εἰς Κρη-  
 μνα ἀγαγεῖν φρον-  
 15 τίςον παυόντων  
 παρ' ὑμῶν ἐξεῖ ΚΕ [?]  
 μελλόντων ΚΑΘΕ-  
 Ε[ . ]ΞΕ[ . ] ΔΩΡΗΝ οἶα ἐς-  
 ταῖ ὅτε [ . ] ΕΛΩΝ χρυ-  
 20 σόν. . ] ΗΚΕΙΝ πα-  
 ρακ ΕΘΗΝΑΙ δῶ-  
 ρον τείνας ἔρρωσο.  
 [ . . . ca. 12/14 . . . ]

*Apparatus*

Lines 1–9: These lines were on a fragment brought in by M. Mellink.

1–2: These lines were originally read by Harrison as τῶν φρουρέων ὁ διασημώτατος δούξ; other scholars have cited this phrase from Harrison's preliminary publication.

Line 10: T might be E, P, I.

Line 12: M might be N, H.

Line 13: αὐτοῦ might be ἄρτου.

Line 16: Π might be T; final E might be T.

Line 17: Final E might be H.

Line 18: First E might be Π; Δ might be A.

Ovacık I.A.ii (lower part; fig. 89)

*Contents*

While the opening is not clear, from at least line 3 this is a list of acclamations in honor of Hermaios, requesting the prolongation of his office of "brigand chaser." The acclamations were perhaps to be sent to Hermocrates (line 3).

For a translation see below, p. 110.

The line breaks at lines 29–31 are not certain.

*Text*

- [ . ] εἰρηναρχ[- . . ? Ἑρμοκρ]-  
 ἀτει ἀγνῶς [ . . . 6/7 . . . ]  
 [ . ] Ἑρμοκράτει Ἑρμ[αῖος]  
 [? ν.] Ἀσκουρέως τῇ πόλε[ι]  
 5 ἵνα δυνάμεθα ζῆσαι.  
 ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐπ-  
 ἰδημείτω. ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰ-  
 ρήνης ἐπιδημείτω. το[ῦ]-  
 το συμφέρει τῇ πόλε[ι].  
 10 ψήφισμα τῷ ληκτοδ[ει]-  
 ώκτη. ὁ εὐγένης λη[c]-  
 τοδειώκτης τὴν π[ό]-  
 λιν φρουρεῖτω. ὁ ληκ-  
 τὰς φονεύσας τὴν  
 15 πόλιν φρουρεῖτω.  
 ὁ ἐκδεικῆσας τὴν

- πόλιν τὴν πόλιν *vac.*  
 φρουρεῖτω. ὁ πολάκι[c]  
 ἐκδεικῆρας τὴν π[ό]-  
 20 λιν ἐπιδημεῖτω. ὁ ἀ[ν]-  
 νώνας ΕΝΝΕCΑ[ . . ]  
 πέμψας ἐπιδημεῖ[τω].  
 ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς [ε]ἰρη[ν]η[c]  
 ἐπιδημεῖτω. Ἐ[ρμαῖ]-  
 25 ος ἐπιδημεῖ[τω. ? ὁ υἱ]-  
 ὅς Ἀσκουρέως ἐ[πιδη]-  
 μεῖτω. Ἐρμαῖος Ἀ[σ]κ[ου]-  
 ρέως ληστοδεῖ[ώκ]-  
 τῆς ἕως ζῶμεν. ἐπ[ιδη]-  
 30 μεῖτω ἵνα δυνάμεθα [ζῇ]-  
 σαι. κατὰ τὴν χέλευσιν τοῦ ἡ-  
 γουμέν[ο]υ ἐπιδημεῖτω. ὁ π[ο]-  
 λάκις εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπιδη-  
 [μεῖ]τω. ὁ τροφὰς τῇ πόλει πέ[μ]-  
 35 ? *vac.* ψας ἐπι- ? *vac.*  
 ? *vac.* δημεῖτω ? *vac.*

*Apparatus*

Line 1: Harrison saw traces of a line above.

Line 2: ΑΤΕΙΑΕΝWC Harrison.

Ovacık I.B.i (figs. 85–86)

There is an uninscribed area of ca. 0.06 meters before the text begins. The face is worn, particularly at lines 18–22. The upper fragments join the lower at line 13.

*Text*

- καὶ ἐξ ἐτέρων [ . . . . ]  
 τε ἔγνων ΜΑΛΙ[ . . . . ]  
 ΜΙΝδείται ΕΑΝ[ . . . . ]  
 ΤΗΤΑΙ ΕΠΙΞΑΤΗΙ[ . . . . ]-  
 5 νείαν τὴν οὐραν[ . . . . ]  
 κώμαις ταῖς π[αρ]? ὑ]-  
 μῶν ΑΝΓΩΕΧΘ[ . . . . ]  
 εἰς τὴν Τερμης[έων]  
 πόλιν [ἵ]γα τοῖς Ε[ . . . . ]

- 10 ΤΑΓ [ . . . ] ΝΟΙCΝ [ . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] φρουρα [ . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] ΑΝΕΝ [ . . . . ]  
 ἀνώνα παρεχ[ . . . . . ]  
 λείπειν αὐτοῖς [ . . . ὕ]  
 15 πὸ τῶν ἀρχόντ[ων . . . ]  
 ΓΝWΝ καὶ Κ[ . . ] ΗΜ[ . . . . ]  
 ταῖς κώμαις ΕΥ[ . . . . ]  
 ΜΕΝΑΕ[?] CΒΟCΤΑ[ . . . . ]  
 [ . . . ] CΕ[ . . ] ΟΜΠΟCΚ[ . . . . ]  
 20 ΝΟΙΠΑΙΑCΧΓW[ . . . . ]  
 [ . . ] ΠΑΤ[ . . ] ΑΜΠΕΖΑ[ . . . . ]  
 [χ]ωρίς τινος ὑπε[ . . . . ]  
 του [ . . ] Π[ . . ] CΑΝΤΕ[ . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] ἡγε]μόνεC[ . . . . ]  
 25 [ . . . . . ] ΧΟΜΑΙ[ . . . . ]

### Apparatus

- Line 1: P could be B.  
 Line 3: M could be H; I could be Y; C could be Ξ; second N could be M.  
 Line 4: First T could be Γ, C; third T could be Y, Π.  
 Line 5: Schuler conjectures [ἐν ταῖς]  
 Line 7: ΝΓ could be ΜΡ. Schuler conjectures ἀνενεχθ[είσαις]  
 Lines 9–11: Schuler conjectures τοῖς ἐ[κεῖ τε]-/ταγ[μέ]νοι cτ[ρατ/ιωται]  
 Line 10: T could be Γ.  
 Line 12: Final N could be ΚΙ.  
 Line 13: ΕΧ could be CΥ.  
 Lines 15–16: Schuler conjectures . . . ἔ]γγων  
 Line 16: M could be Π, W.  
 Line 18: M is very doubtful; first C could be Κ.  
 Line 19: First C could be Ε, Γ; Π could be Τ.  
 Line 20: N could be W; Π could be Κ; X could be Κ; Γ could be Ε, Ρ.  
 Line 21: Ζ could be Ξ.  
 Line 22: N could be Δ.  
 Line 23: CΑΝ could be ΑΛW.  
 Line 24: C could be Ρ.  
 Line 25: I could be C.

Ovacık I.B.ii (fig. 90)

We have no text.

## Ovacık I.C.ii (fig. 91)

The upper part (i) is lost, and it is not clear how long the full lines are in the lower part, which survives.

## Contents

The people at line 3 may be the same people as in line 22 and inscription II. line 2. Line 17 ought to be the opening of a new document, the letter from [-]lios Aquilinos to Hermaios and the other *protokometai*. If so, line 23 is probably not a date.

## Text

- [ . . .  
 [ . . . . . ] ΔΟ[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . ] ἐποιης[ - . . . . ]  
 ΑΜΛΔΕΩΝΤΩΝΗC [ . . . . ]  
 [ . . . ] ἐφεδρεύνοντι[ . . ]  
 5 [ . ] τη πόλει κατηγε[ . . ]  
 Ο τήν κώμην ΔΗ[ . εἰ]-  
 ρηνάρχον μὲν ΠΡΟ[ . ]  
 ΑΙC Μαρ. Αὐρ. ΗΛΛΩΑΦ[ . ]  
 ρον ΒΟ[ . . ] ΑΔΟΥ καὶ βο-  
 10 υλευτῆς καὶ ΔΗΖ[ . . -]  
 αρχος Α[ . . . ] Μ[ . ] WOK [ . . ]  
 [ . ] αἰς ΙΑ[ . . ] ΑΤΕΙCΛΗΙ  
 [ . ] COI Ἑλιοδωρο[- . ] Ἑρμ-  
 [έ]ου καὶ Ν[ . ] ΑΝΕΥ[ . ] ΙΕΜ  
 15 [ . . ] ΝΟC καὶ ὑποφύλαξ [ ? τοῦ]  
 [ε]ἰρηάρχου ἐν ΕΥ[ . ]  
 [ . . -]λιος Ἀκυλεῖνος  
 διασημώτατος ἡγ[ού]-  
 [με]νος Ἑρμέω Ἀσκου-  
 20 ρέως καὶ τοῖς λοιπ[οῖς]  
 πρωτοκωμήτεσ[ ? τῶν]  
 ΑΛΛΑΝΕ[ . ] Ν χειρεῖν  
 [ . ] ΝΕΤΕΙΑΚΤΤΑC  
 [ . ] ΑΤΕ [ . . ] Κ [ . ] Η[ . . .  
 [ . . . At least 4 lines follow.







- [ . . . . . ] ΛΥΡΙΟ[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . ] ΓΗ[ . . . ] ΕΜ[ . . . ] οὐδέ  
 [ . . ] ΕΠΙΦ[ . . ] ΥΔΕΤΗ  
 15 [ . ] ΡΛΟΥΑ[ . ] ψηφίς  
 [ . ] ω Έρμα[ι]ω ΠΕΜ[ . ]  
 ΘΩΤΕ [ . ] ΗΧΙΣΕΙΑ[ . ]  
 ΕΧΕΛ[ . ] ΨΕΥΙΩ[ . . ]  
 ΗC νεικηφόρων  
 20 παιδα[ . . ] ΕΙΚΗΛ  
 ΑΛ[ . ] ὑπέρ της πόλ[εως]  
 [ . . . . ] ΠΙCΜΑΚΛΚ  
 CΟΙ[[ . . . . . ] ΔΟC [ . . . ]  
 [ . . ] ΔCΠΥ[ . . . ]

*Apparatus*

- Line 1: ? πόλιν κώ[μας τε πᾶς]/ας  
 Line 3: B could be K, X; H could be EI.  
 Line 4: First O could be Θ; second O could be K.  
 Line 12: P could be E.  
 Line 13: ΓΗ could be EN.  
 Line 14: Π could be B.  
 Line 17: W could be M.  
 Line 18: First W could be M.  
 Line 19: EI could be A.  
 Line 20: Second A could be W.

## Ovacık I D.ii (fig. 92)

The block is in relatively good condition to the right, but the left side is largely lost.

*Text*

- [ . . . . . ] Η[ . . . . . ]  
 [ . . . . ] Ν καὶ ΤΑCΚΕ[ . . . ]  
 [ . ] ἔδει ὥστε ἐν ἀσφαλί-  
 [α . . ] ΔΗ μετὰ δὲ τὰ πά[ν]-  
 5 [τα ἀ]σφαλῶς ποιησα[ . . ]  
 [ . . . ] πάλιν προτρέπο-  
 [με]ν ἀνήγειν εἰς τὴν  
 [λα]μπρὰν Τερμηκέ-  
 [ων] πόλιν καὶ ταύτην

- 10 [ . . . ]ΤΕ χείρισε μεταξύ  
 [ . . . τῶ]ν π[ρ]ωτευνόντων  
 [ . . . . ]ΝΑΝΑ καὶ τῶν βο[υ ? ]-  
 [λευτ]ῶν πολείτων καὶ  
 [τῶν ν]εανίσκων φροῦρο-
- 15 [ . . . . ]ΟΥΝ[ . . ]ΘΩΔΕΦΑ  
 [ . . . . ]Η χεὶρ στρατιωτ [- . ]  
 [ . . . . ]Ε ἐφ'εστῆκε [ . ]  
 [ . . . . ]ΓΗ ἥτισουν  
 [ . . . . . ]μεριμνοῖ[. ?]
- 20 [ . . . . . . . ]ησει περὶ  
 [ . . . . . . . ]ταμιᾶΥ[ . ]  
 [ . . . . . . . ]γαρ [ . . ]  
 [ . . . . . . . ]οἶκον  
 [ . . . . . . . ]ΞΕΙΝ[ . ]
- 25 [ . . . . . . . ]ΠΑΡΕΞΙ  
 [ . . . . . . . ]ΖΕΖΕΥΧΟ  
 [ . . . . . . . ]ΑΝΤΙ vac.  
 [ . . . . . ? vac.

### Apparatus

- Line 4: First Δ could be Α; Schuler conjectures εἶν]α.  
 Line 5: Final Ι could be C, N.  
 Line 9: THN are in ligature.  
 Line 10: First T could be K: perhaps με]τεχείρισε  
 Line 12: First N could be KI; second N could be Λ.  
 Line 13: Second WN are in ligature; K could be T.  
 Line 24: Ξ could be C.  
 Line 27: Final Ι could be Α.

### Ovacık II and III

Ovacık II and III were copied by Harrison in 1978 (notebook 1, pp. 148–50) and again in 1980 (notebook 2, pp. 102–9). They were found again by B. Iplikçioğlu and A. and G. Çelgen and published by them in *Neue Inschriften aus NordLykien*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1992), nos. 2 and 3, pls. 4, 5 and 8 (the latter are photographs of good squeezes); they were republished from that publication as SEG 41.1390 with emendations by H. Pleket. They were republished from these publications by Zimmerman in “Probus, Carus und die Räuber,” 267–68; copied by Gary Reger in 1999. The two inscrip-

tions are on panels (III on one measuring  $0.89 \times 0.37$  m; II on one measuring  $0.89 \times 0.36$  m) recessed on the face of a long block ( $2.29$  m long  $\times$   $0.52$  m high  $\times$   $0.60$  m deep) now in the courtyard of the Elmalı museum. III is to the left of inscription II. The letters average  $0.03$  meters in size. In III.6 there are abbreviation marks: a bar over the initial M of *Μαρ*, and a vertical with dots above and below after *ΑΥΡ*.

For illustrations, see the publication of Iplikçioğlu, Çelgen, and Çelgen.

## Ovacık II

## Text

Οὐαλ. Εὐήθιος ἑπαρχος *vac.* Κιλιορτη  
 προοίκῳ κώμης ΛΑΛΛεων χαιρεῖν.  
 ἐπειδὴ πυνθάνομαι ἐκ τοῦ συστήματ[ος]  
 τῶν ἐπιτολασάντων τῇ Τετμησέων [χώ]-  
 5 ρα ληστῶν ὑπολελίφθαι [οὐδένα] περὶ  
 τὴν ἀποικίαν καὶ πέπ[εισμαι] ? . . .  
 διὰ τοῦ συνλημφθῆ[ναι] . . .  
 [ . . .

## Apparatus

- Line 1: Εὐήθιος Harrison; Εὐήθιος Iplikçioğlu  
 Line 2: Harrison conjectures Ἀδαλέων; Pleket (*SEG*) cj. Α[σκουρ]εων,  
 Zimmerman conjectures Α(σ)[κουρ]εων; Reger reads ΛΗΜΕΩΝ.  
 Line 4: Τητετμησέων Iplikçioğlu, corrected by Zimmerman  
 Line 5: ῥαληστῶν Iplikçioğlu, corrected by Zimmerman; nothing after  
 ΦΘΑΙ, Iplikçioğlu; Zimmerman conjectures [τινάς ὡς πάσχειν]  
 Line 6. καὶ ΠΕ[ . . . Harrison.  
 Line 7. ΔΙΑ might be ΔΡΑ.

## Ovacık III

## Text

βουλῆς *vac.* δήμου *vac.* δόγμα  
 τὸν ἀξιολογώτατον καὶ ἐνδοξό-  
 τατον καὶ εἰρήνης προστά[τη]ν ἀρχι-  
 ερέα γινόμενον τοῦ ἀνεικῆτου Σεβαστοῦ

- 5 καὶ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καισάρων καὶ πᾶσαν λει-  
τουρ[γ]ίαν τελέσας (*sic*) Μαρ. Αὐρ. Κιλιορτην υἱὸν τοῦ γε-  
[ν]ομένου Μαρ. Αὐρ. Ἑρμαίου Ἀσκουρέως προστάτου  
[τῆς εἰρην]ης [? γεν]ομένο[υ]

### Apparatus

- Line 1: δογματι Iplikçioğlu  
Line 3: TATHN Ip., TA[ . . ]N Harrison  
Line 5: ΛΕ Harrison, ΛΕΙ Iplikçioğlu  
Line 6: ΤΟΥΡΓΕΙΑΝ Iplikçioğlu  
KΙΑΙΟΡΘΗΝ Iplikçioğlu; at end, ΓΕ Iplikçioğlu  
Line 7: ΝΟΜΕΝΟΥΜΑΡ Iplikçioğlu  
ΑΚΚΟΥΡΕΩ[C . . Iplikçioğlu  
Line 8: [12] . . . C[ . . . . . ]ΜΕΝΟ[ . . . Iplikçioğlu.

## Commentary

### The Documents

#### Inscription I

The outline of the contents of the sides is as follows:

- A.i.1–22: A letter from Aurelius Ursio, *perfectissimus dux*.  
A.ii.(?)1–36: A series of acclamations for Hermaios, son of Askoureus.  
He is a brigand chaser and has protected the city: these lines request that he remain in office, probably as *eirenarch* (an office that has to be confirmed by the Roman authorities).  
B: We only have the upper part. This starts in the middle of a text, and the *vacat* above it is shorter than that in A or D. It may well, therefore, follow C.  
C: The upper part is missing. The lower part has a document with, perhaps, a list of local officials (?). Then, at line 17, a letter begins, from [–]lios Aquilinus, apparently a *perfectissimus dux*, to Hermaios and the other *protokometai* of the community.  
D: This also starts in the middle of a document. There is not much to make out, but the first lines would fit well with acclamations: so D may continue A.



*Inscriptions II and III*

These are on two adjacent panels set into a long block that presumably formed part of a monument. Both honor Kiliortes, the son of Hermaios (son of Askoures), who appears in inscription I: inscription II is a letter, apparently congratulating him on the suppression of brigands, while inscription III is a resolution in his honor by a council and people (so, by a city).

*Date*

Inscription I and inscriptions II and III refer to a father and a son, respectively. They cannot be more than twenty to thirty years apart in date, and they could be extremely close, since father and son could have been active at the same time; it is indeed more economical to assume that the men were active contemporaneously, particularly since they are both concerned with controlling brigands.

M. Christol published a list of third-century officials with the title of *perfectissimus dux*, used of Ursio in inscription I and first found at the end of the reign of Gallienus.<sup>6</sup> While Ursio's exact function is uncertain, Aquilinus, in the same document, is described as *perfectissimus hegoumenos*, which seems to mean that he was a governor. The earliest known equestrian governor in the area is Terentianus Marcianus, *perfectissimus dux*, now known to have been in office in 278.<sup>7</sup> The governor of Lycia was of *clarissimus* rank certainly by 363 and probably by the reign of Constantius II (337–61).<sup>8</sup>

Kiliortes (inscriptions II and III) was high priest of a single emperor and his sons. While such a position would probably still have been possible under Constantine, the office is more easily accommodated in the third century than in the fourth—in which case, the emperors concerned are Carus and his sons in 282–84, as Zimmerman concludes.<sup>9</sup> Mitchell therefore suggests that these inscriptions should be associated with the unrest in the area that culminated in the siege of Cremna in 278,<sup>10</sup> a conclusion that Zimmerman had reached independently.

6. M. Christol, "Un duc dans une inscription de Termessos (Pisidie)," *Chiron* 8 (1978): 529–40.

7. *PLRE* I, Marcianus 22; S. Mitchell, "The Siege of Cremna," in *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*, ed. D. H. French and C. S. Lightfoot (Oxford, 1989), 311–28; S. Mitchell, *Cremna in Pisidia: An Ancient City in Peace and in War* (London, 1995), 177–218.

8. See J. Reynolds et al., "Roman Inscriptions, 1976–80," *JRS* 71 (1981): 121–52, 128.

9. "Probus, Carus und die Räuber," 271–72.

10. On the siege, see Mitchell, "The Siege of Cremna."

## The People

*Roman Officials*

*Aurelius Ursio, perfectissimus dux* (I.A.i.1). The name is attested of a Frankish noble in the sixth century;<sup>11</sup> but it seems most economical to identify this man with a benefactor of Arycanda honored in a recently published inscription (S. Sahin, *I. Arykanda* [Bonn, 1994], 26):

τὸν κράτιστον Ἀ[ . . .  
 Αὐρ. Οὐρσίωνα [ . . .  
 πραιτωριανῶν [ . . .  
 ἡ πόλις τὸν ἑαυτ[ῆς . . .  
 καὶ εὐεργέ[την

The editor suggests reading λογιστής in the first line. The word appeared to start with A or Λ. The editor then suggested ἀπὸ πραιτοριανῶν in lines 2–3; but Nicholas Milner has now very kindly shown us a newly discovered inscription from Balboursa, which confirms Ursio's titles as *dux* and *tribunus praetorianon*.<sup>12</sup> We might compare Marcianus, attested as a *perfectissimus protector* at Philippopolis under Gallienus, who was τριβούνος πραιτωριανῶν καὶ δοῦξ καὶ στρατελάτης.<sup>13</sup> Praetorians are attested in this area at about this time by honors offered at Termessos to an otherwise unknown praetorian prefect, Ulpius Silvinus.<sup>14</sup>

τὸν ἐξοχώτατον  
 ἑπαρχον  
 τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου  
 [ . . . ca. 14–16 . . . ]  
 5 [ . . . ca. 14–16 . . . ]  
 [ . . ca. 5–6 . . ]  
 Οὐλπιον Σιλουῖνον  
 ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος,  
 τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργ-  
 10 γέτην τῆς πόλεως.

11. *PLRE* III, Ursio.

12. N. Milner, "Further Inscriptions from Balboursa and the Survey Area no. 9," in *Balboursa—A Highland City and Its Territory*, ed. J. Coulton (forthcoming).

13. *PLRE* I, Marcianus 2, from *AE* 1965.114; C. Roueché, "Rome, Asia, and Aphrodisias," *JRS* 71 (1981): 103–20, 116 n. 91.

14. *TAM* III.1.126, pointed out by Stephen Mitchell; the inscription was erected under a single emperor, whose name was erased.



The term *kratistos* is used of both senators and equites at this date.

[–]lius Aquilinus, *perfectissimus hegoumenos* (I.C.ii.17–18). This man writes a letter to the chief villagers. It is difficult to interpret his title as meaning anything other than “governor.” An Aquilinus is honored in a verse inscription at Olympus (Lycia).<sup>15</sup>

τὸν στρατῆρος κοσμοῦντα θεηγενέος βασιλῆος,  
τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς ἄξιον ἐκ προγόνων,  
ἢ πατρίς Οὐλύμπος στήσεν βουλαῖς Ἀκυλεῖνον  
κοιναῖς σκευα(μέ)νη, βαιὰ χαριζομένη.<sup>16</sup>

While the man honored at Olympus was a local citizen, he had distinguished himself in imperial service, under a single emperor. The editors of *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* assumed that his service was elsewhere in the empire; the new evidence suggests that we are already dealing with the phenomenon, common in the later empire, of local citizens serving as governors in their local area. This was routinely forbidden by imperial legislation and could be seen as further evidence of unusual circumstances.

*Hermocrates* (I.A.ii.3). Apparently the recipient of the series of acclamations asking for Hermaios to remain in office, Hermocrates seems most likely to be a governor, since the acclamations are requesting that Hermaios remain in office κατὰ τὴν χέλευσιν τοῦ ἡγουμέν[ο]υ, “according to the order of the governor.”

*Valerius Euethios, eparchos* (II). This man writes to Kiliortēs. The term *eparchos/praefectus* is very vague; a man with the simple title of *eparchos* died fighting brigands ἐν συνπλοκῇ ληστῶν.<sup>17</sup> It is extremely tempting to identify this man with the Valerius Euethios attested as *rationalis/καθολικός* in five papyri and an inscription at Luxor, datable between 302 and 304.<sup>18</sup> If the dating already suggested for these texts is correct, this inscription comes from an earlier period in his career.

### Locals

*Askoureus* (I.A.i.3; I.A.ii.4, 26, 27; III.7). Zimmerman very reasonably conjectured that this might be an ethnic, the name of the village from which

15. PLRE I, Aquilinus 4.

16. TAM II.1173, reconsidered by L. Robert, *Hellenica* IV (Paris, 1948), 36.

17. L. Robert, *Etudes Anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), 97, from the Bursa Museum.

18. PLRE I, Euethios. See Zimmerman, “Probus, Carus und die Räuber,” 269–71, for a full discussion.

Hermaios came; but it seems clear from the full text that it is the name of the father of Hermaios.

(*M. Aur.*) *Hermaios* (I.A, C, and D; III) This man receives the letter from Ursio (I.A.i.3–4), instructing him to mobilize (?) a group of young men and perhaps lead them to Cremna. That letter gives him no title. He is honored by a city (nameless) with acclamations (I.A.ii) as a brigand chaser. He receives a letter from Aquilinus, addressed to him “and the rest of the *protokometai*” (I.C.ii.19); he appears to be mentioned in I.D.i.3, 16. He appears as the father of the honorand, Kiliortes, in inscription III.

*M. Aurelius Kiliortes* (II, III). This son of M. Aurelius Hermaios (III) receives a letter from Valerius Euethios, addressed to him as *prooikos* of the *kome* (II). He is honored by the council and people of a city (presumably Termessos) as the high priest of a single Augustus and his Caesars—presumably Carus. He is *axiologotatos* and *endoxotatos* and is described as “protector of the peace,” προστάτης εἰρήνης—a relatively rare term, characteristic of the third century, as Zimmerman observes.<sup>19</sup> The similar name *Killortes* is attested at Arykanda of one or more very prominent citizens,<sup>20</sup> at Rhodiapolis in the Opramoas inscription,<sup>21</sup> and at Idebessos.<sup>22</sup>

*Mar. Aur. [-]ros* (I.C.ii.8). This man can perhaps be identified with Heliodoros (?) (I.C.13).

*Heliodoros* (?) (I.C.13). This man is possibly the son of Hermaios.

### Places

*Termessos* (I,II). Mentioned twice, as a destination (I.B.i.8, I.D.ii.8) and as the area in which Ovacik is found (II), it is also presumably the πόλις (city) mentioned at I.A.ii, passim and at I.D.i.1, whose officials are the ones there mentioned, and whose council and people were responsible for inscription III.

*Cremna* (I.A.i.13). Hermaios is to conduct there something/someone, almost certainly the νεανίσκους ἐπιλέκτους, “selected young men,” whom he has been instructed to deal with in some way.

*Kome* (I.C.ii, II). A *kome* is mentioned in I.C.ii. Inscription II is addressed to Kiliortes as *prooikos*, “leading inhabitant,” of a *kome*. The name of the community appears in II.2 and apparently in I.C.ii.3 and 22; but, frustratingly, it appears impossible to read more than ΑΛΛΛΕΩΝ in any of these cases. The most reasonable conjecture, therefore, remains Harrison’s

19. “Probus, Carus und die Räuber,” 273. See also Mitchell, *Cremna in Pisidia*, 34.

20. *I. Arykanda* 44–45, 46 and 48, 79, 111, 120.

21. *TAM* II.905.

22. *TAM* II.838.

Ἀδαλεων.<sup>23</sup> The document goes on to refer to brigands who have been cleared away from the area around the *apoikia*, "settlement"; this is apparently another term for the same settlement, but it is an extremely unusual one.<sup>24</sup> Martin Zimmerman reports that the settlement at Ovacık appears to be made up of buildings mostly constructed at about the same time; this and other sites in the region give the impression of being new settlements. It may be that this period saw various kinds of evolution in rural settlements, perhaps experimenting with new institutional structures; this could also provide a context for the petition of Orcistus to Emperor Constantine requesting civic status,<sup>25</sup> as well as providing a backdrop for the emergence of the monastic settlements of the following period.

*Komai*, "villages" (I.B.i.6).

### Offices

*Archiereus* (III). This is the high priest of the imperial cult, presumably the civic cult at Termessos.

*Bouleutes*, "councillor" (I.C.ii.9?). This is presumably a member of the city council of Termessos.

*Agoranomos* (I.D.i.4). This is a standard magistracy in most Greek cities; there is too little context to interpret its function here.

*Hypophylax* (I.C.ii.15). The ὑποφύλαξ is a title in the Lycian *koinon*; its bearer served under the *archiphylax*, and both officials seem to have been concerned, above all, with ensuring the peaceful operation of the tax-collection system.<sup>26</sup> Zimmerman has studied the office and pointed out that it could be held by relatively modest members of the elite.<sup>27</sup> This is the only identifiable reference to an official of the *koinon*.

*Lestodioktes*, "brigand chaser" (I.A.ii.10–11, 28). Ληστοδιώκτης is found in the glossaries, under *latrunculator*; Malalas uses the term of Rheges, a military officer stationed at Caesarea who helped the *dux* of Palestine deal with a Samaritan uprising in or about 484.<sup>28</sup>

23. Pleket and Zimmerman conjectured, very reasonably, that the villagers were the Askoureis, but the argument for *Askoureis* as an ethnic is not supported by the full text. Reger has recently read *Lemeon*.

24. Zimmerman and Schuler have confirmed to us that the term is not otherwise attested in the inscriptions of Asia Minor.

25. The petition is most recently published in A. Chastagnol, "L'inscription constantinienne d'Orcistus," *MEFRA* 93 (1981): 381–416.

26. M. Wörle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitliche Kleinasien*, *Vestigia* 39 (Munich, 1988), 149–50.

27. M. Zimmerman, "Zwischen Polis und Koinon: Zum *Hypophylax* im Lykischen Bund," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 21 (1993): 107–20.

28. John Malalas *Chronicle* 382 and *Chronicon Paschale* 327, with *PLRE* II, Rheges.

*Eirenarch*, "peacekeeper" (I.A.ii.1; ?I.C.ii.6-7, 16). This is a standard magistracy in Greek cities; see "Municipal Government" later in this appendix.

*Neaniskoi*, "young men" (I.A.i.7, I.D.ii.14). See "Municipal Government" later in this appendix.

*Protokometes*, "leading villager" (I.C.ii.21). The earliest example of this term is apparently in a late second-century inscription from Lydia (TAM V.822, dated to 198/9); it is found in texts and papyri of the fifth and sixth centuries (so, e.g., at Aphrodito in A.D. 542).<sup>29</sup> By the sixth century it certainly seems to indicate someone with responsibilities for the collection of taxes from the community; it is impossible to say whether this was the case earlier, but it is characteristic of the late Roman period that primacy in a community and fiscal responsibilities should be combined.<sup>30</sup>

*Prooikos komes* (II). The term *prooikos* has a rather general sense of "person in charge"; its primary use was for administrators of large estates, and it is interesting to see its transfer to, apparently, the preeminent personage of a village. Again, the usage implies the close links between local prominence and responsibilities toward a higher authority.<sup>31</sup>

### Historical Setting

The link between these inscriptions is M. Aurelius Hermaios. The purpose of inscription I seems to be to record documents that honor Hermaios. The purpose of inscriptions II and III—which may or may not be later—is to honor Hermaios's son, Kiliortes. He is described (in inscription II) as *prooikos* of his village; but in inscription III he is honored by a city, as a priest of the imperial cult. The city concerned must be Termessos. While the name of the village cannot be made out, it is also apparently referred to as an *apoikia* of the city; its administration is the responsibility of the city of Termessos, as is stressed in the acclamations in inscription I.

### The Imperial Government

While the local hierarchy is relatively clear, that at the level of Roman government is less so, since an excessive number of Roman officials seem to be involved. It is simplest to conclude not only that inscriptions II and III are not necessarily contemporary with inscription I but also that the documents in inscription I are not necessarily contemporary with one another.

29. PCair, Mas 3, document 67286.

30. On this term, see Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen*, 235.

31. See Zimmerman, "Probus, Carus und die Räuber," 277; Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen*, 235-36.



It is difficult not to see Aquilinus as a governor. We know that Terentianus Marcianus, *perfectissimus dux*, was in office in 278, when he put up a dedication to Probus at Cremna.<sup>32</sup> Marcianus was also honored at Sagalassos (his hometown), Termessos, and Trebenna, all in Lycia. He appears to be the *hegemon* who led the Roman attack on Cremna when it was being held by rebels—normally described by the authorities as brigands (*lestai*)—under their chief Lydius. He may, therefore, have been the first such appointment, brought in to deal with a particular military problem; but the insurrection at Cremna was only part of a larger peacekeeping problem, as is reflected in these inscriptions.

It may be, therefore, that we should try to fit Ursio, Aquilinus, and Marcianus into a sequence of governors—presumably of Lycia-Pamphylia; perhaps we should add Hermocrates, while Euethios appears to be holding a special military command. But it may be inappropriate to try to impose such order on the shape of the Roman administration at such a difficult period. There are other evidences of unusual commands in Lycia at precisely this period. The bearer of one such command, L. Aurelius Marcianus, was honored at Termessos.<sup>33</sup>

τὸν διασημώτατον δουκ(α)  
 Λ. Αὐρ. Μαρκιανὸν  
 ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος  
 τὸν πάτρωνα καὶ εὐεργέτην τῆς  
 5 πόλεως  
 καὶ εἰρήνης προστά-  
 την

The epithet “protector of the peace” [προστάτης εἰρήνης] is used of Kiliortes in our inscription III. Some years earlier, in the reign of Valerian, Oenoanda honored a certain M. Valerius Statilius Castus, “commander of the vexillations” and “concerned with peace.”<sup>34</sup>

Οὐαλέριον Στατείλιον Κάστον, τὸν κράτιστον σύμμαχον τῶν Σεβαστῶν πραιπόσιτον βιξιλατιῶνων, Τερμησέων τῶν πρὸς Οἰνοάνδοις ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ γεροῦσία τὸν εὐεργέτην, προνοησάμενον τῆς εἰρήνης κατὰ θάλασσαν καὶ κατὰ γῆν, ἐπιδημήσαντα τῇ λαμπρᾷ ἡμῶν πόλει μετὰ πάσης εὐκοσμίας.

32. *PLRE* I, Marcianus 22; Mitchell, “The Siege of Cremna” and *Cremna in Pisidia* 208–10.

33. *TAM* III.1.88, reedited by M. Christol in “Un duc.”

34. *BCH* (1886): 227, republished as *IGRom* III.481, *ILS* 8870.

At Termessos Maior there are also two inscriptions honoring *kratistoi praepositi*, whose functions are not indicated.

- βουλῆς καὶ δή-  
μου δόγματι  
τὸν κράτιστον  
πραιπόσιτον  
5 Ἰουστεῖνον  
ἢ λαμπρὰ Τερ-  
[μησέων τῶν]  
μειζόνων πό-  
λις, τὸν ἴδιον αὐ-  
10 τῆς ἐν πᾶσιν  
εὐεργέτην.

(TAM III.80)

- βουλῆς καὶ δή-  
μου δόγματι τὸν  
κράτιστον πραι-  
πόσιτον Κωνσταν-  
5 τεῖνον ἢ λαμπρὰ  
Τερμησέων τῶν  
μειζόνων πόλις,  
τὸν ἴδιον αὐτῆς  
βουλευτὴν καὶ ἐν  
10 πᾶσιν εὐεργέτην.

(TAM III.82)

These men are likely to have been in office in the later third century; the Latin title might indicate a military command, but it is in the early fourth century that we first hear of the *praepositi pagorum*, officials responsible for the areas of a city's territory, who seem already to have been well established by 311.<sup>35</sup> The second man mentioned here, Constantinus, is described as a councillor — which presumably means that he was a local citizen; he was very probably responsible for a dedication to the tetrarchs found north of the city.<sup>36</sup>

What seems clear is that a wide range of government representatives, with different titles, were operating in this area in the late third century. It is

35. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), 725–26.

36. TAM III.943.



also clear that some of those holding offices for the imperial government were in fact local citizens—so Aquilinus and Constantinus. Someone with the title of *dux* or *hegemon* at this period may simply be a governor carrying out normal responsibilities or may be a special officer carrying out specific military functions. Although this region of Asia Minor had had an endemic problem with brigandage, it was only the instability of the mid- to late third century, when the wider security problems of the Roman empire gave new momentum to internal disturbances, that transformed “brigands” into “rebels.”<sup>37</sup> These developments focused attention on the function of Roman officials in the provinces. In such a crisis as that in Lycia, the government responded by creating special commands and by replacing governors of senatorial rank with experienced army officers or reliable local notables; it is likely to be these real pressures, rather than some sophisticated policy of excluding senators from office (the so-called Edict of Gallienus), that drove this development in the late third century. More importantly, such circumstances will have drawn attention to the unwieldy size of many of the provinces and encouraged their division into smaller units in a series of reforms that culminated in the reforms of Diocletian.<sup>38</sup>

#### *The Municipal Government*

Policing the difficult terrain was a major concern in Lycia; the *koinon* (provincial assembly) of the area appointed policing officials, the *archiphylax* and the *hypophylax*, although their principal responsibility seems to have been ensuring the proper collection of taxes.<sup>39</sup> This did not, however, obviate the need for security enforcement at the city level and in the remote villages. The settlement at Ovacık was evidently within the territory of Termessos. The difficult terrain of the area clearly forced a relatively high level of responsibility for their own safety on the villagers; but the appointment of leaders to organize local defense had to be at least approved by the city. We know that Termessos appointed an *eirenarch* for at least one area of its *territorium*, known as τῶν ἄνω χωμῶν καὶ Δρύμου (TAM III.104). Heberdey argued that “the upper villages and the *drymos*” were two of the administrative areas into which the *territorium* was divided;<sup>40</sup> a recently

37. See the excellent overview by Mitchell in *Cremna in Pisidia* 211–17.

38. See C. Roueché, “The Functions of the Governor in Late Antiquity: Some Observations,” *Antiquité Tardive* 6 (1998): 31–36, for other factors in this process; that article is focused on the civil side of those changes and failed to emphasize sufficiently the security considerations, for which see Roueché, “Rome, Asia, and Aphrodisias.”

39. See above, discussion under “offices” and n. 26.

40. R. Heberdey, *Termessische Studien* (Vienna, 1929), 5–15, and “Termessos” in *RE* V.a (1934): 733–37.

published inscription balances this with a reference to a village as being in the lower area, ἐν Νέα Κώμῃ τῇ κάτω.<sup>41</sup>

Hermaios and Kiliortes are not described specifically as *eirenarchs* but seem to be local village leaders who performed very similar functions — Hermaios as a *lestodioktes*, “brigand chaser” (I.A.ii), and Kiliortes as someone who had defeated and captured brigands (II). The language of inscription II is similar to that of a letter of Commodus praising the people of Bubon for the capture and defeat of brigands in their area.

καὶ ὑμᾶς τῆς προθυμίας καὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας ἐπήνεσα καὶ τὴν κοινὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους ἀπεδεξάμην, ὑμᾶς μὲν σὺν τοσαύτῃ τῇ προθυμίᾳ ὁρμήσαντας ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ληστῶν σύνλημψιν καὶ περιγενομένους γε αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀποκτείναντας, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ζωγρήσαντας.<sup>42</sup>

The appointment of *eirenarchs* had to be approved by the governor.<sup>43</sup> This requirement for approval at a higher level was probably intended to guard against abuses. When the people of Hierapolis appointed *paraphylakes*, “guards,” for their villages, they were adjured not to obtain more than their designated supplies, and it was stipulated that the *komarchai* must not be forced to “crown” them (i.e., give them money).<sup>44</sup> Those *paraphylakes* were posted in the villages for a particular period; their residence there was described as *epidemia*, the term used of the presence of the *lestodioktes* in I.A.ii. Similarly, the proconsul wrote to Aezani how he had thought it suitable ποιήσασθαι τὴν παρ’ ὑμῖν ἐπιδημίαν,<sup>45</sup> while a third-century proconsul wrote to the Aphrodisians that he would visit their city as long as there was no imperial ruling that prevented it — κωλύει τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἐπιδημεῖν τῇ πόλει.<sup>46</sup>

Hermaios, therefore, seems to have held an office — that of *lestodioktes* — that was similar to that of the *eirenarch* and subject to the same requirement of approval by the governor, since this is apparently what is being requested in I.A.ii.31: κατὰ τὴν κέλευσιν τοῦ ἡγουμέν[ο]υ ἐπιδημεῖτω. Despite the

41. B. Iplikçioğlu, G. Çelgin, and V. Çelgin, “Termessos ve Egimenlik Alam Epigrafik,” *XV. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 1997 (1998), 371–81, 374 (pointed out to us by Martin Zimmerman).

42. F. Schindler, *Inscriptionen von Bubon* (Vienna, 1972), 2.

43. Aristides *Or.* 50.72 and *Cod. Just.* X.77.

44. J. G. C. Anderson, “A Summer in Phrygia: Part 1,” *JHS* 17 (1897): 396–425, 403, republished as *OGI* 527.

45. *LBW* 841, republished as *IGRom* IV.572, reconsidered by L. Robert in *Études Anatoliennes*, 301–5.

46. J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1981), document 48, lines 21–22.

references to the city, the request is probably that Hermaios should remain in residence at Ovacık. The acclamations are then intended to stress that this is to the advantage of the city as a whole, even if in practice it may involve strengthening and endorsing the power of a local magnate in his own area. It was presumably in that capacity — whether before or after the occasion of the acclamations, we cannot be sure — that he was responsible for gathering a group of “young men,” *neaniskoi*, apparently to take them to Cremna, most probably to help the Roman troops besieging that city in 278 (I.A.i). The “young men” — young adults who had finished their training as ephebes — were a recognized group within the city, and they were regularly used in this way. At Apollonia Salbake, a group of “young men” under a *paraphylax* policed the mountains around the city.<sup>47</sup> Despite the dramatic circumstances, therefore, the traditional institutions of the city appear to be functioning in these texts. There is, however, one apparent innovation: the recording of the acclamations in honor of Hermaios.

### Acclamations

The set of acclamations here, although it is probably not complete, is one of the longer surviving inscribed series.<sup>48</sup> It has not been edited for inscribing; instead, in its constant repetitions, it resembles the series found in manuscript records — for example, in records of the church councils. This is by far the best preserved section of the inscription.

ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιδημείτω.  
 ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρηνης ἐπιδημείτω.  
 το[υ]το συμφέρει τῇ πόλει.  
 ψήφισμα τῷ λητοδ[ει]ώκτῃ.  
 ὁ εὐγένης λη[ε]τοδewόκτῃς τὴν π[ό]λιν φρουρεῖτω.  
 ὁ ληστας φονεύσας τὴν πόλιν φρουρεῖτω.  
 ὁ ἐκδεικνύσας τὴν πόλιν τὴν πόλιν φρουρεῖτω.

47. J. Robert and L. Robert, *La Carie*, vol. 2, *Le plateau de Tabai* (Paris, 1954), 281–38; C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* (London, 1993), 123–24, 152.

48. Cf. the acclamations for Albinus at Aphrodisias: see C. Roueché, “Acclamations in the Later Roman Empire: New Evidence from Aphrodisias,” *JRS* 74 (1984): 181–99, with a more general discussion: the texts are republished in C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (London, 1989), nos. 83–84. See also the acclamations of the city of Perge discussed in C. Roueché, “*Floreat Perge*,” *Images of Authority*, ed. M. M. Mackenzie and C. Roueché, Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 16 (Cambridge, 1989), 206–28, and also discussed by P. Weiss, “Auxe Perge. Beobachtungen zu einem bemerkenswerten städtischen Dokument des späten dritten Jahrhunderts,” *Chiron* 21 (1991), 353–91.



ὁ πολάκι[c] ἐκδειχῆς τὴν π[ό]λιν ἐπιδημεῖτω.  
 ὁ ἀ[ν]ώνας ΕΝΝΕCΑ[ . . ] πέμψας ἐπιδημεῖ[τω].  
 ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς [ε]ἰρή[ν]η[c] ἐπιδημεῖτω.  
 Ἑρμαῖος ἐπιδημεῖτω. ? ὁ υἱὸς Ἀσκουρέως ἐπιδημεῖτω.  
 Ἑρμαῖος Ἀ[σ]κ[ου]ρέως λητοδοει[ώκ]της ἕως ζῶμεν.  
 ἐπ[ι]δημεῖτω ἵνα δυνάμεθα [ζῇ]σαι.  
 κατὰ τὴν χέλευσιν τοῦ ἡγουμέν[ο]υ ἐπιδημεῖτω.  
 ὁ π[ο]λάκις σώσας τὴν πόλιν ἐπιδημεῖτω.  
 ὁ τροφὰς τῇ πόλει πέ[μ]ψας ἐπιδημεῖτω

[Let him who (acts) on behalf of the city reside! Let him who (acts) on behalf of peace reside! This is of benefit to the city. A decree for the brigand chaser! Let the well-born brigand chaser guard the city! Let him who has killed brigands guard the city! Let him who has often acted as *ekdikos* for the city guard the city! Let him who has acted as *ekdikos* for the city reside! Let him who has . . . sent *annona* reside! Let him who (acts) on behalf of peace reside! Let Hermaios reside; let the son of Askoureas reside! Hermaios, son of Askoureas, as brigand chaser as long as we live! Let him reside so that we can live! Let him reside according to the order of the governor! Let him who has often saved the city reside! Let him who has sent supplies to the city reside!]

There are several typical structures here. For example, the phrasing "he who does so and so, let him . . ." is widely paralleled.

Σεβήρος ἄρτι ἀναθεματισθῇ  
 ὁ ἐπίβουλος τῆς τριάδος ἄρτι ἀναθεματισθῇ  
 ὁ κατὰ τῶν πατέρων ἄρτι ἀναθεματισθῇ  
 ὁ ἀναθεματίσας τὴν σύνοδον Χαλκηδόνης ἄρτι ἀναθεματισθῇ.<sup>49</sup>

This repetition of the same phrase in a series of acclamations is also found in our text and must of course have facilitated their use. Another method to make the acclamations flow more easily is to change one half of a sentence and then the other: A + B, A + C, A + D, then D + E, D + F. There is also the occasional recurrence of an earlier line, almost like a refrain. Another characteristic construction is the dative of direction or purpose.

49. Acclamations from Constantinople in 518, reported to the Council of Constantinople in 536; ACO III, 73.

Λέοντα τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ῥώμης τοῖς διπτύχοις.

.....  
τὰ δίπτυχα τῶι ἄμβωνι.<sup>50</sup>

These acclamations therefore follow standard rules; but an even more interesting aspect is their use. They were clearly recorded to be sent to higher officials, in support of a request for the extension of Hermaios' command. This foreshadows the ruling by Constantine in 331 that acclamations of provincial assemblies praising or blaming a governor should be conveyed directly to the emperor.<sup>51</sup> Yet again, the legislation seems to have come in the wake of the practice. It may be, also, that we are seeing evidence of how the direct use of acclamations is associated with the development in the late antique period of new power structures that increasingly bypass civic institutions; it is interesting that another recently discovered set of acclamations, very probably from about the same period, was recorded on the occasion of the granting of privileges to a rural community in the territory of Magnesia.<sup>52</sup>

It remains to try to determine the precise function of these acclamations. The frequent mentions of the *polis* suggest that these were recorded at a public assembly at Termessos; their presence on the inscription of Ovacık seems to be as part of a dossier of documents in praise of Hermaios and does not require him to have been acclaimed there. The presence of the inscriptions honoring Kiliortēs strongly suggests that this was the center of the family's estates and their power; they are "chief men of the village," but they also play a part of the life of the city.

Hermaios has been in office for some time; he has "killed brigands" and has also in some way been responsible for bringing food supplies to the city — perhaps ensuring their delivery from the countryside to the city when brigandage was making this difficult. The situation could resemble that in the mid-sixth century, when the plague was preventing country people from bringing food to the city of Myra; the citizens saw it as the responsibility of Nicholas, abbot of the monastery of Sion, to resolve the situation.<sup>53</sup> But Hermaios is also described as having acted as *ἐκδικος*. This term is hard to assess. In the imperial period, it is used of people who have represented a city as lawyers, and it designates one among many services for which a bene-

50. *ACO* III, 74.

51. *Cod. Theod.* I.16.6, repeated as *Cod. Just.* I.40.3; see Roueché, "Acclamations," 186.

52. See the inscription of the Pylitae, published by H. Malay "Letter of the Proconsul Taurus and the People of Pylitai near Tralles," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 11 (1988): 53–58, with the considerations of J. Nollé, "Epigraphische und numismatische Notizen 9: zu der neuen Stele aus dem Museum von Aydin," *Epigraphica Anatolica* 15 (1990): 121–26, and the republication, *SEG* 38 (1988): 1172.

53. *Vita Nicholae Sionitae* 52–57.

factor may be praised. In the fourth century, the term appears describing a new official, called in Latin the *defensor*, who is appointed by the imperial government to judge local cases, offering a fair hearing to people low in the social scale.<sup>54</sup> It may be that the *ekdikos* of the imperial period could sometimes have a similar function; a man is honored in Lydia by the people of two villages whose affairs he had "judged and reestablished": τετιμηθέντα τῇ τοῦ ἀνδριάντος ἀναστάσει ὑπὸ Ἀρχηγῶν καὶ Ναγδημῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ἐ(κ)δικῆσαι καὶ ἀποκαταστήσαι τὰ τῶν κωμῶν (*TAM* V.974.7).

It is uncertain whether Hermaios had represented the rights of the city or adjudicated in local disputes, but the latter makes good sense in the circumstances, particularly if these were disputes in the villages where he was operating. We cannot determine whether he performed this function as a representative of the "city," in the old sense of the term, or as an imperial representative, in the late antique sense. Yet again, we are dealing with terminology in transition. This is a useful reminder of the crucible of tensions from which the fourth-century reforms emerged. Local country landowners and their retainers were used by the imperial government to help to maintain peace; local officials were not only appointed subject to imperial approval (as before) but even given direct authority by the imperial government. This may well be the case with Hermaios, both as an *ekdikos* (although we cannot know) and as a "brigand chaser." If the term *lestodioktes* as used by Malalas to describe a situation in the late fifth century has the same force that it had at the end of the third, then Hermaios is not called an *eirenarch* because he is not a civic official but a local citizen appointed by the imperial government to keep the peace in difficult times; he receives instructions directly from Ursio, just as his son receives a letter directly from the *praefectus* Euethios. In both cases the receipt of those letters is enough of a distinction to warrant its inscription.

There is undoubtedly much more to be extracted from these fascinating texts; both our readings and our interpretation leave much room for improvement. One thing that makes them difficult to interpret is that they exemplify a period of evolution, as the settled fabric of the Roman imperial period was transformed into the very different world of late antiquity, which Martin Harrison illuminated with scholarly care.

54. The first example is in Egypt in 331; see Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 726–27 and n. 31. R. S. Bagnall (*Egypt in Late Antiquity* [Princeton, 1993], 165) emphasizes the continuing uncertainties over the exact role of the *ekdikos*; see, most recently, *POxy* 3771 and commentary there.